

Remarks

The Office Action dated March 22, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 5-19 and 24-28 are pending in this application. Claims 1-25 are subject to restriction/election requirement. Claims 1-4 and 20-23 have been cancelled. Claims 26-28 are newly added.

Paragraph [00010] has been amended to correct a typographical error.

In response to the Office Action dated March 22, 2005, Applicants elect for prosecution in this application all claims that belong to Group II, i.e., Claims 5-16.

Group I Claims 1-4 have been canceled and Group I dependent Claims 5-8 have been amended to depend directly or indirectly from Group II independent Claim 9. Accordingly, Group II includes Claims 9-16 and 5-8. Further, newly added dependent Claims 26-28 depend from Group III independent Claim 17 and are submitted to also be included in Group III.

The requirement for election is traversed because the inventions set out by the claims in Groups II and III clearly are related. Applicants submit that a thorough search and examination of any Group would be relevant to the examination of the other Group and would not be a serious burden on the Examiner. Additionally, requirements for election are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C.

Further, Applicants submit that the claims of Group II and the claims of Group III are related as subcombination (Group II) and combination (Group III) and are not patentably distinct in accordance with MPEP §806.05(c). Particularly, Applicants submit that the claims of Group II and Group III have been amended so that the combination as claimed requires the particulars of

the subcombination. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the restriction requirement is improper and reconsideration of the election requirement is requested.

Further, Applicants elect, with traverse, species A shown in Figure 2 for examination. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 5-14, 17-19, and 24-25 are readable upon species A.

The requirement for election is traversed because the species A and B clearly are related. Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claims 9 and 17 are generic and are readable on species A and B. Applicant also submits that a thorough search and examination of species A would be relevant to the examination of species B, and would not be a serious burden on the examiner. Additionally, requirements for election are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. Accordingly, reconsideration of the election requirement is requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael Tersillo", written over a horizontal line.

Michael Tersillo
Registration No. 42,180
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070